

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/002,450	02/27/98	GUTKONITZ-KRUSIN	D EDS-010

BRANDON N. SKLAR, ESQ.  
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, LLP  
345 PARK AVE  
NEW YORK NY 10154-0053

LM32/0210

EXAMINER

DASTOURI, M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2723	

**DATE MAILED:** 02/10/00

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

## Interview Summary

Application No. <b>09/032,450</b>	Applicant(s) <b>Gutkowicz-Krucin et al</b>
Examiner <b>Mehrdad Dastouri</b>	Group Art Unit <b>2723</b>

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mehrdad Dastouri (PTO)

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Mr. Rodney T. Hodgson (Reg. # 37,849)

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Jan 19, 2000

Type:  Telephonic  Personal (copy is given to applicant applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: Yes  If yes, brief description:

Agreement  was reached.  was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 14

Identification of prior art discussed:

Cabib et al (U.S. 5,784,162) ; Lee et al (IEEE Paper, ISBN: 0-7803-2553-2); and Bostock et al (IEEE Paper, ISBN: 0-85296-573-7)

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Mr. Hodgson explained the draft amendment dated January 5, 2000, to independent Claim 14 and indicated that the amended claim, in particular, the limitation of "weight coefficient for each parameter value and the threshold value are selected to maximize specificity, under the constraint of 100% sensitivity to melanoma, on a representative set of training images", is not disclosed by prior arts of record. The Examiner disagreed and indicated that the constraint of 100% sensitivity to melanoma is a theoretical concept and the result of 92.4% sensitivity to melanoma disclosed by Bostock (prior art of record) is a reliable practical constraint. The Examiner further indicated that claiming 100% sensitivity would require strong technical support and providing an affidavit.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1.  It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2.  Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

*clu*

*Amelia Au*  
Amelia Au

Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2700

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.